## Rošhka Heyman & DeWulf

ROSHKA HEYMAN & DEWULF, PLC ATTORNEYS AT LAW ONE ARIZONA CENTER 400 EAST VAN BUREN STREET SUITE 800 PHOENIX, ARIZONA 85004 TELEPHONE NO 602-256-6100 FACSIMILE 602-256-6800



2003 FED 25 P 4: 12

AZ DELE PERSON

February 25, 2003

Docket Control Arizona Corporation Commission 1200 West Washington Street Phoenix, Arizona 85007

Re:

Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, et. al

Generic Restructuring—Track B

E-00000A-02-0051 E-01345A-01-0822

E-00000A-01-0630 E-01933A-02-0069

Dear Madam or Sir:

Attached for filing in the docket referenced above, please find a copy of Tucson Electric Power Company's ("TEP") Response to the informal request for information by the Arizona Corporation Commission Utilities Division ("Staff"). The Response was prepared by Mr. Ed Beck of TEP and provided to Mr. Jerry Smith of the Staff.

A copy of this filing is being provided to all parties of record.

Sincerely,

Raymond S. Heyman

For the Firm

RSH/srs

cc:

Ed Beck

Jerry Smith

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

FEB 2 5 2003

DOCKETED BY

## Response of Tucson Electric Power Company to informal Staff Request for Information Docket No. E-00000A-02-0051, et. al February 24, 2003

Attached below is a table that shows the energy numbers for three situations. The column labeled Energy (N-1) GWH is the amount of RMR energy for the three years based on N-1 criteria. The last two columns reflect the RMR energy levels based on TEP operating criteria. The column with the heading from workshop reflects the RMR energy numbers that TEP used in the workshop discussions for Track B. The last column with the heading "refined" reflects TEP current estimate of RMR energy needs based on a review of TEP operating tables for the three years in question. TEP feels the refined numbers are more reflective of the actual RMR energy needs for the three years. These numbers do not reflect any load shed impacts that will tend to reduce the need for RMR. As we had discussed on Tuesday the use of load shed arming for N- 2 situations will reduce the need for RMR.

| RMR Study |           |                     |                        | from workshop       | Refined  |   |
|-----------|-----------|---------------------|------------------------|---------------------|--|---|
|           | SIL (N-1) | System Peak<br>Load | Annual Hours<br>in RMR | Energy (N-1)<br>GWH | Energy (Based on<br>TEP operating<br>criteria) GWH | Energy (TEP<br>operating<br>criteria) GWH |
| 2003      | 1606      | 1930                | 337                    | 37.31               | 183.08   | 141.40                                    |
| 2004      | 1785      | 1996                | 163                    | 13.80               | 213.79   | 157.61                                    |
| 2005      | 1785      | 2066                | 341                    | 37.93               | 253.14   | 190.48                                    |

You had also asked a question on Tuesday regarding TEP's modeling of RMR generators relative to Qmax and Qmin. I asked one of my planners for a quick explanation of TEP's modeling relative to these parameters and got the following response:

Generator Qmin and Qmax in the power flow cases are determined from the generator curves supplied by the manufacturer and from unit test reports. In TEP's operating study, the local generating units are set such that each unit supplies approximately 20MVARs. The units are set at this value so that the units will have sufficient room to move in either direction during a disturbance. The power flow model then runs and allows the units to respond within their defined parameters.